

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,167	12/04/2001	George S. Shaginaw	31991.00005	2859
23619 7590 07/27/2007 SQUIRE SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP TWO RENAISSANCE SQUARE, 40 NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE SUITE 2700 PHOENIX, AZ 85004-4498			EXAMINER	
			DASS, HARISH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
i iioLNix, nz	2 03004 4470		3693	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/006,167	SHAGINAW ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Harish T. Dass	3693				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 M	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 May 2007</u> .					
·= ·	· 					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 37-47 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-36 and 48-117 is/ar 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 37-47 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	re withdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 10.	epted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate				

Art Unit: 3693

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement

Examiner acknowledges receipt of applicant's election of claims 37-47 (Group III) for examination transmitted on 5/14/2007.

Status of claims:

Claims 1-36 and 48-117 are canceled.

Claims 37-47 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 37, 38-39 & 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kailamaki et al. (hereinafter Kailamaki – US 2002/0029197) in view of Brown (US RE37,857).

Re. Claim 37, Kailamaki discloses receiving a billing data structure including one or more billing records having billing information at the bill processing entity, the billing data structure including a rate element attribute that defines a chargeable unit [Abstract; Figures 2-3, 6, 17-18; paragraphs 02, 26-27, 51-56 (transfer to a standard format), 94 (different price), 112-115 (data fields, structure of the CDR file; CDR)].

Art Unit: 3693

Kailamaki does not explicitly disclose performing a verification process on the billing data structure;

rejecting all or part of the billing data structure if it fails the step of performing a verification process;

and processing the billing data structure at the bill processing entity if the data structure passes the verification steps.

However, Brown discloses these steps [Abstract; Figures 9-11, 14, 16 and associated descriptions; Col. 1 lines 10-37; col. 3 lines 6-37; col. 4 lines 18-25]. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Kailamaki and include performing a verification process on the billing data structure; rejecting all or part of the billing data structure if it fails the step of performing a verification process; and processing the billing data structure at the bill processing entity if the data structure passes the verification steps, as disclosed by Brown, to check the integrity and sufficiency of data received at the data input.

Re. Claims 38-39 & 44-45, Brown further discloses wherein the step of performing a verification process further comprises verifying that the billing data structure is properly formatted, wherein the step of performing a verification process further comprises verifying an audit information field for proper values, rejecting the billing data structure comprises rejecting the complete data structure if identification information in an identification section are not verified, and rejecting all or part of the billing data structure comprises rejecting only billing records if the billing records fail a verification process. It

Application/Control Number: 10/006,167

Art Unit: 3693

would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Kailamaki and include above steps, as disclosed by Brown, to check the integrity and sufficiency of data received at the data input to generate error free billing to customer.

Claims 40-43 and 46-47are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kailamaki and Brown as applied to claim 37 above, and further in view of Friedman et al. (hereinafter Friedman - US 2002/0082991).

Re. Claims 40-43 and 46-47, Kailamaki or Brown *does not explicitly disclose* receiving the data over an Internet connection, a direct wired connection, a wireless connection, or a removable storage medium. However, an Internet connection, a direct wired connection, a wireless connection, or a removable storage medium for data transfer and download are will-known. Further Friedman discloses receiving the data over an Internet connection, a direct wired connection, a wireless connection, and a removable storage medium [Abstract; Figures 4C, 6, 9; paragraph 28]; wherein the step of processing the billing records comprises noting incoming billing records as an accounts payable and reconciling the accounts payables against accounts receivables, wherein the step of processing the billing records further comprises reconciling all accounts billable and accounts receivable at the end of a period [Abstract; Figures 4C, 6, 9; paragraph 23, 25, 33, 66-67 and claims]. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures

Application/Control Number: 10/006,167

Art Unit: 3693

of Kailamaki and Brown to include the above steps as disclosed by Friedman, to provide

Page 5

telecommunication cost management method for analyzing billing, automatic

reconciliation and auditing bills from telecommunication vendors.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Harish T. Dass whose telephone number is 571-272-

6793. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:50 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, James A. Kramer can be reached on 571-272-6783. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Harish T Dass Harish T Dan Examiner

Art Unit 3693

7/18/07